



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/482,926	01/14/2000	Jae Joung Beom	046-0658P-SP	7693

7590 10/09/2002

Birch Stewar Kolasch & Birch
P O Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

LY, ANH

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER
2172

DATE MAILED: 10/09/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/482,926	BEOM, JAE JOUNG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anh Ly	2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 08/05/2002 with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Claims 13-14 have been added.
3. Claims 1-14 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in–
(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

5. Claims 1-2 and 6-7 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,229,801 issued to Anderson et al. (herein Anderson).

With respect to claim 1, Anderson discloses a memory for storing table IDs and version numbers of sections for each of the table IDs, a combination of at least one of the sections forming a table which added information defines as claimed (abstract, col. 6, lines 30-48, col. 11, lines 51-67, col. 13, lines 20-67 and col. 14, lines 1-67); a comparing unit for determining matching of a table ID included in a present section with the table IDs stored in the memory upon reception of the present section, and comparing the version number of the matched table ID to the version number of a received section

number as claimed (col. 6, lines 30-48); and a section processing unit for receiving and processing the present section if it is determined that the version number stored in the matched table ID is not the same as the version number of the present section as claimed (col. 12, lines 51-64).

With respect to claim 2, Anderson discloses wherein the section processing unit skips the section received at the present time if it is determined at the comparing unit that no table IDs match, or if the version number stored in the matched table ID is the same as the version number of the received section as claimed (abstract, col. 5, lines 54-64, col. 6, lines 30-48 and col. 11, lines 51-67).

With respect to claim 6, Anderson discloses (1) upon reception of a present section, determining matching of the table ID included in the present section with the table IDs stored in the memory; (2) if it is determined in the step (1) that the table IDs match, determining whether the version number included in the received section is the same as the version number stored in a version memory of the table ID; and (3) if it is determined in the step (2) that the two version numbers are not the same, receiving and processing the present section as claimed (abstract, col. 6, lines 30-48, col. 11, lines 51-67, col. 12, lines 51-64, col. 13, lines 1-67 and col. 14, lines 1-67; col. 5, lines 54-64).

With respect to claim 7, Anderson discloses skipping the section received at the present time if it is determined in the step (1) that there are no table IDs matched, or if it is determined in the step (2) that the two version numbers are the same as claimed (col. 11, lines 51-67, col. 13, lines 1-67 and col. 14, lines 1-67).

With respect to claim 10, Anderson discloses determining starting of the received section with reference to a pointer field if a payload-syntax-indicator is '1' in a transport packet before the step of determining matching of the table ID included in the section and the table IDs stored in the memory as claimed (payload layer: col. 2, lines 9-67, col. 7, lines 15-32 and col. 9, lines 5-22).

With respect to claims 11-14, Anderson discloses determining starting of another section if the next data is not OxFF after the present section comes to an end before the step of determining

matching of the table ID included in the section and the table IDs stored in the memory as claimed (col. 6, lines 30-48, col. 9, lines 5-66 and col. 11, lines 26-67); (3) further includes the step of automatically updating a version value stored in the version memory with a new version number upon reception of a section having the new version as claimed (col. 5, lines 54-64); wherein the section processing unit stores the present section if it is determined that the version number stored in the matched table ID is not the same as the version number of the present section and wherein the step (3) includes the step of storing the present section if it is determined in the step (2) that the two version numbers are not the same as claimed (col. 6, lines 30-48, col. 11, lines 51-67, col. 12, lines 51-64, col. 13, lines 1-67 and col. 14, lines 1-67; col. 5, lines 54-64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3-5 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,229,801 issued to Anderson et al. (herein Anderson) in view of 6,134,554 issued to Freimann et al. (herein Freimann).

With respect to claim 3, Anderson discloses a device for filtering added information as discussed in claim 1.

Anderson does not explicitly indicate, "a new version number when a section with a new version is received."

However, Freimann discloses new version as claimed (col. 9, lines 21-67 and col. 10, lines 1-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Anderson with the teachings of Freimann so as to have a device for filtering added information and a step of receiving a new version number. This combination would provide for initializing the section number in a table section; each table section is checked as received to determine and the table processing is the transport the table section filtering. Filtering reduces the application processor workload for parsing table sections and the required size of working areas in memory to manage table data (Anderson – col. 6, lines 30-48 and col. 11, lines 20-67) in the MPEG filtering in formation environment.

With respect to claims 4-5, Anderson discloses a device for filtering added information as discussed in claim 1.

Anderson does not explicitly indicate, "mask enables the version number of the section if it is determined that the table is completed."

However, Freimann discloses bit stream as well as mask bits processing as claimed (see fig. 4 and figs 9A and 9B, col. 6, lines 6-67, col. 9, lines 30-67, col. 10, lines 1-67and col. 11, lines 1-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Anderson with the teachings of Freimann so as to have a device for filtering added information and a step of receiving a new version number. This combination would provide for initializing the section number in a table section; each table section is checked as received to determine and the table processing is the transport the table section filtering. Filtering reduces the application processor workload for parsing table sections and the required size of working areas in memory to manage table data (Anderson – col. 6, lines 30-48 and col. 11, lines 20-67) in the MPEG filtering in formation environment.

With respect to claims 8-9, Anderson discloses a device for filtering added information as discussed in claim 6.

Anderson does not explicitly indicate, "(6) mask enabling the version number of the present section if it is determined in the (5) step that the table is completed."

However, Freimann discloses bit stream as well as mask bits processing as claimed (see fig. 4 and figs 9A and 9B, col. 6, lines 6-67, col. 9, lines 30-67, col. 10, lines 1-67 and col. 11, lines 1-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Anderson with the teachings of Freimann so as to have a device for filtering added information and a step of receiving a new version number. This combination would provide for initializing the section number in a table section; each table section is checked as received to determine and the table processing is the transport the table section filtering. Filtering reduces the application processor workload for parsing table sections and the required size of working areas in memory to manage table data (Anderson – col. 6, lines 30-48 and col. 11, lines 20-67) in the MPEG filtering in formation environment.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (703) 306-4527. The examiner can be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, see the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu, can be reached on (703) 305-4393.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (703) 746-7238 (after Final Communication)

or: (703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

or: (703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, or Customer Service Center, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (receptionist).

Inquiries of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

AL a



KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Oct. 2nd, 2002.